

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/779,248 | 02/08/2001 | Ruchi D. Kapoor | M-11063 US | 9962 |
| 33031 | 7590 03/08/2005 | EXAMINER | | |
| | L STEPHENSON ASO WOOD SPRINGS RD. | MOORE, IAN N | | |
| BLDG. 4, SUITE 201 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| AUSTIN, TX 78759 | | | 2661 | |
| | | DATE MAILED: 03/08/2005 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| 1 | |
|----|--|
| iA | |
| U | |

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|---------------|--|--|
| 09/779,248 | KAPOOR ET AL. | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| Ian N Moore | 2661 | | |

| Before the Filing C | or an Appear Brief | Examiner | Art Unit | |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| | | Ian N Moore | 2661 | |
| The MAILING DAT | E of this communication appe | ears on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence add | lress |
| THE REPLY FILED 22 Februar | γ 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS | APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO | OR ALLOWANCE. | |
| applicant must timely file application in condition for | one of the following replies: (1) or allowance; (2) a Notice of Ap | g a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abar) an amendment, affidavit, or other peal (with appeal fee) in complianc e with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu | evidence, which plac e with 37 CFR 41.31; | es the or (3) a |
| | res 3 months from the mailing date o | f the final rejection. | | |
| | | risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o | | er is later. In no |
| MONTHS OF THE FINA | L REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f | • | | |
| peen filed is the date for purposes of CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the | determining the period of extension a he expiration date of the shortened st d by the Office later than three month | which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the as after the mailing date of the final rejection | The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2) | on fee under 37 as set forth in (b) |
| 2. The reply was filed after t | ief in compliance with 37 CFR 4 | neal, but prior to the date of filing and the state of th | hs of the date of filing | g the Notice of |
| | | time period set forth in 37 CFR 41. | | |
| ` · | • • | , but prior to the date of filing a brie posideration and/or search (see NO | | because |
| (b) They raise the issue | e of new matter (see NOTE belo | • | · | the issues for |
| appeal; and/or | | corresponding number of finally re | | , 110 100000 101 |
| NOTE: (S | ee 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)) | | - | |
| _ | • | 121. See attached Notice of Non-Co | ompliant Amendment | t (PTOL-324). |
| | ercome the following rejection(s | • | 4: | |
| the non-allowable claim(s | s). | allowable if submitted in a separate | • | |
| how the new or amended The status of the claim(s) | the proposed amendment(s): a) claims would be rejected is pro) is (or will be) as follows: | □ will not be entered, or b) □ wovided below or appended. | ill be entered and an | explanation of |
| Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: | <u></u> . | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDE | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence because applicant failed to | dence filed after a final action, b to provide a showing of good ar | out before or on the date of filing a North of the sufficient reasons why the affida | | |
| • | ented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | g a Notice of Appeal, but prior to th | e date of filing a brief | will not be |
| entered because the affid showing a good and suffi | avit or other evidence failed to clent reasons why it is necessa | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S | al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d) | nils to provide a (1). |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other ev REQUEST FOR RECONSIDER | • | on of the status of the claims after e | entry is below or attac | ched. |
| 11. X The request for reconsid | deration has been considered bu | ut does NOT place the application i | | |
| 12. Note the attached Inform | nation Disclosure Statement(s). | . (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper | No(s). | 4 |
| 13. 🔲 Other | | | | 1 |
| | | | | HUNKULH EXAMINER |
| | | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding claims 1,9,16 and 23, the applicant argues that there is no motavation to combine Hegde and McKee. In response to applicant argument, McKee clearly states the motavation in col. 1, lines 5-35 and col. 3, lines 5-35, that it would facilitate the identification of significant data items relevant to management of a network. Regarding the arguement on page 9, applicant is arguing the limitations that are not being claimed.